

City of Springfield  
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, March 15, 2004 at 6:00 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Lundberg, Fitch, Ballew, Ralston, and Woodrow. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

1. Springfield Inventory of Natural Resource Sites.

City Planner Mark Metzger presented the staff report on this item. The council is scheduled to receive public testimony at its April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting concerning the Springfield Inventory of Natural Resource Sites. The Draft Inventory is a periodic review task product under Statewide Planning Goal 5. Mr. Metzger referred to Attachment 1, included in the agenda packet, which is the Overview of the Goal 5 Inventory Process and Critical Issues. Approving the Inventory includes decisions about the criteria the city uses to place a resource site on the Inventory, and how resource sites should be protected. At tonight's work session, staff will brief council members on the issues and on the Planning Commission's recommendation.

In September 2002, the council approved a staff proposal to separate from the City of Eugene and Lane County for the purpose of completing the Springfield portion of the Natural Resource Inventory. The council instructed staff to use the "significance criteria" it had approved earlier for placing sites on the Inventory and further directed staff to move ahead with its analysis on the assumption that the standard process described in Statewide Goal 5 would be applied to the resource sites.

Staff compiled and presented a Draft Inventory of Natural Resource Sites to the Planning Commission last spring. Staff presented a description of each of the resource sites and also described the "standard process" and "safe harbor" provisions of Statewide Goal 5 which offer communities two different approaches to protecting resource sites. Mr. Metzger explained the differences between the "standard process" and "safe harbor" and the length of time needed for each. At their meetings on April 15, May 6, and September 16, 2003, the Planning Commission received testimony and deliberated at length on the Draft Inventory and on whether to apply the "safe harbor" or "standard process." The Commission's discussion focused on the following issues: the inclusiveness of the "significance criteria" council approved for placing resource sites on the Inventory; the time, and cost of using the standard process in treating the Inventory; and the potential impact of protection measures on Springfield's buildable land supply.

At their September 16 meeting, the Commission voted 5 to 0 (2 absent) to recommend that the council adopt the Draft Inventory based on the significance criteria that council had approved and

apply the “safe harbor” provisions of Statewide Goal 5 (described in OAR 660-23) to “upland” resource sites and the “standard process” to “riparian” and “wetland” sites.

Mr. Metzger said staff mailed out a notice to all affected property owners last week. A copy of that letter was also distributed to council members last week. Mr. Metzger received calls from about a dozen property owners today, most of them asking what this meant to them. He provided those citizens with questions a map showing their properties and what would be affected. The decisions council will make on April 5 include whether or not these are still the right significance criteria and if “standard process” or “safe harbor” should be used. He discussed the Planning Commission’s recommendation. For upland areas, the city has put into place since this process began in the late 1980’s, a tree felling ordinance and a hillside protection ordinance that includes many of the protections that were recommended in the original reports for this inventory. These ordinances may not include all of the protections council wants, but the Planning Commission determined these areas could be covered under “safe harbor”. For upland areas there is something called wildlife habitat. If council chooses safe harbor, staff would work with the Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine where the threatened or endangered plant and animal species are located in our urban growth area. Staff would work with this and other federal agencies to determine the correct kind of protection for those species. He gave an example of an incident involving an endangered plant species near a building site.

He discussed some plant species on the threatened and endangered list located in the South Thurston Hills. He discussed some of the animal species affected along the McKenzie River and other river systems. There is a pollution pond belonging to Weyerhaeuser located in the Jasper Natron area. The area around that pond would need to be protected because Fantail Pigeons habitat there.

Mr. Metzger referred to two maps on the wall that highlighted some of the affected areas. There are upland areas that may drop off the inventory. Staff would work with different wildlife services to identify the location of endangered species. Protection pockets would be created for those areas. The Planning Commission said to retain the standard process for wetlands and riparian areas. Mr. Metzger said it is important to go through the standard process for wetlands. Under safe harbor, the city delineates the wetland areas, which staff has done in an inclusive report on wetlands in Springfield. He discussed conditions in place regarding development near wetlands. Riparian areas also need the standard process. He discussed stormwater protection measures that have been adopted. It would be at the discretion of the council to determine what type of protection measures would apply to riparian areas. Any protection measures would come to council for approval. The stormwater protection measures are significant and match up with the city’s safe harbor approach for riparian areas. Staff would go through the analysis, but may not come back with anything any more stringent for protection of the riparian areas than is already in place.

Councilor Woodrow asked why upland areas are being removed from inventory prior to knowing if there are plant or animal species that need to be protected.

Mr. Metzger said that if council followed the Planning Commission recommendation of using safe harbor, this map shows what items would drop off the list. That decision has not been made.

Staff has maps that show where known occurrences of endangered plants and animals reside. The state does not want the city to post those areas because of collectors who gather those species illegally.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the areas listed have endangered species.

Mr. Metzger said there are some species in this location. This map was to illustrate what would happen if the Planning Commission's recommendation was implemented by the council. In the report itself, there is a full listing of all sites, but this map shows the impact if these were dropped. Staff does know where the endangered species are located on those sites and that protection measures would need to be taken.

Councilor Fitch asked about the cost and time involved in the standard process versus the safe harbor.

Mr. Metzger said the estimate for completing the Natural Resource Study Inventory and Protection Measures is about \$50,000 for standard process. For safe harbor the cost would be about \$12,000. Most of that cost would be spent in confirming where the species are located, meeting with state agencies to determine the appropriate protection measures, and adopting those measures.

Councilor Fitch asked what would occur once those areas were ready to be developed.

Mr. Metzger described the process they would have to go through in determining if development could occur in these locations. There is an Environmental, Social, Economic and Energy (ESEE) analysis which determines the consequences of allowing development to occur. There is a balance of the value of the development compared to the value of the wetlands and riparian areas as it benefits the community. Policies are developed for each area to determine where development can occur and where protection needs to occur.

Councilor Lundberg asked if there was federal or state funding that would accompany one of these two processes. She asked if there was a benefit in using one or the other process.

Mr. Metzger said with regard to the Natural Resource planning process, the state has already awarded all their funding and are moving on to other priorities. He is not aware of funding from the federal government for this type of use. If the city proceeds with the standard process, city staff time and money would be used. Staff would continue to look for additional outside funding, but it is not guaranteed.

Mayor Leiken asked City Attorney Joe Leahy for a best guess regarding Measure 7 that was passed and was ruled unconstitutional. If this were to be applied based on how Measure 7 was originally passed, could we move forward on this Natural Resource Study and would it be valid.

Mr. Leahy said it could present some difficulties to this, but Mr. Metzger's evaluation of the safe harbor presents the potential to work with property owners. It also provides the potential to

minimize, if not eliminate, those issues. Those issues will never go away, whether they are factual or not.

Mayor Leiken said our staff has done a great job in looking at this in a way to be sensitive to property owners. Based on requirements by the state, staff has done an extraordinary job. This process provides flexibility and allows the city to work with property owners. We have opportunities to preserve, but also to manage quality growth. He thanked the Planning Commission for their prior examination of this issue. Overall this is a good quality job by staff as they have looked at the long-range vision and plan.

Mr. Metzger said he appreciates a council that has a sense of fairness and balance and wants to do right by the people.

Councilor Fitch said it is her perception that property owners could do some development with restrictions on the upland areas.

Mr. Metzger said under safe harbor the inventory for the upland areas goes away, except for the small areas where the city is required to protect known plant and animal species. He gave an example of development occurring near a protected area and the balance involved.

Councilor Fitch said this would affect our available land when the Natural Resource Inventory Study is completed. She asked at what point we could transfer that to our residential or commercial lands. She said we need to look at the urban growth boundary.

Mr. Metzger said that is required in the Oregon Administrative Rules. Once the process is completed, whether standard process or safe harbor, it must be determined how many acres have been taken out of the land inventory and if there is still a twenty year buildable supply that the city is commissioned to maintain.

Councilor Fitch asked if there could be an estimate of how much property would be taken out prior to the study being complete.

Mr. Metzger said a determination of that amount would occur when council takes official action. Staff could give council estimates based on whether safe harbor or standard process is used.

Mayor Leiken said due to time constraints, council needs to issue further questions to Mr. Metzger in writing.

Mr. Metzger gave examples of comments council may receive from citizens regarding this topic.

Councilor Ralston confirmed that under the standard process the city has more flexibility, but could be held more liable. Under the safe harbor criteria, state and federal guidelines must be followed.

Mr. Metzger explained the protections in place under both processes.

Councilor Ralston said he agrees that we should give property owners more flexibility, but he is concerned of the consequences.

## 2. Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway Design.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. During the February work session about the Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Parkway, councilors commented that they wanted to see other videos or examples of two lane roundabouts with heavy vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Councilors also expressed concerns about pedestrian safety, vehicle speeds approaching the roundabout, and the need for intense public education if a two lane roundabout is constructed.

Mr. Arnis played a video of two lane roundabouts in Florida and Maryland that carry about 30,000 to 40,000 vehicles a day with heavy pedestrian use. This is very comparable to the expected traffic volumes at the Harlow/Hayden Bridge Way two lane roundabout proposal. With a two lane roundabout at this location, access could be provided to the Wayside neighborhood. He explained the issues regarding access to that neighborhood with a signaled intersection. He said the roundabout would provide a service level of B, whereas a signaled intersection would have a service level of D or E. There is about a \$100,000 cost difference between the construction of the roundabout versus the signaled intersection, with the roundabout costing less. He discussed the safety of the roundabout. The strongest drawback of a two lane roundabout is that currently there are no two lane roundabouts in the metro area. A significant amount of education needs to be done by city staff regarding the roundabout.

Staff has also been working with Lane Transit District (LTD) about how to include an exclusive lane for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in the southern segment of the Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway. The existing right-of-way in the southern segment is 50 feet. In 1998, after many years of meetings and negotiations, the city and property owners agreed to locate the future MLK Parkway in the old railroad right-of-way. The property owners and city agreed to as narrow of right-of-way as possible, consequently bike lanes and sidewalks were excluded and an only minimal shoulder and median would be built with a sound wall in a right-of-way of 73 feet. City staff currently recommends a 76 foot right of way (additional 3 feet is for the sound wall footing) with BRT operating in mixed traffic with possible traffic operation modifications at intersections such as transit priority. LTD staff will likely request a BRT exclusive lane in an 86 foot right-of-way that leaves an existing transmission line in the median. The LTD Board has authorized LTD staff to coordinate with the city to purchase about 10 feet of additional right-of-way out to 86 feet. The Board did not authorize funds to relocate or place the transmission line under ground. If the transmission lines were placed under ground, only about 82.5 feet of right-of-way would be needed. City staff could support an 82.5 foot right of way that has the transmission line placed under the ground or relocated if LTD were willing to:

- Provide funds to under ground the SUB transmission line.
- Provide adequate funding to buy all the additional property and pay for mitigating all the septic drainfield and property impacts for an 83 foot right-of-way.
- Ensure community support from the neighborhood and policy support at the County Board level.

Mr. Arnis said LTD staff and board members, as well as a number of affected neighbors are expected to speak at the public hearing following this work session. He understood there was a petition circulating through the neighborhood regarding the BRT lane. He discussed other issues that may be addressed during the public hearing this evening including the opening of Seward Street and the soundwalls.

For the MLK Parkway project to be ready for the 2005 construction season, the design elements should be approved by the city and county by April. This allows time to work out final design issues, locate utilities, and acquire right-of-way.

Councilor Ralston asked which lane the BRT would be using in the roundabout in the 76 foot proposal.

Mr. Arnis said he was not sure which lane they would use. There would be landscaping in the center of the roundabout.

Councilor Woodrow referred to page 3 of 42, included in the agenda packet which discussed the open house staff provided for affected neighbors. He asked why an option was not given to the neighbors in the Wayside area to have a five lane intersection at Hayden Bridge and MLK without Seward being open.

Mr. Arnis discussed the issues involved in that proposal. Staff did include the options in the packets distributed at the open house.

Councilor Woodrow discussed the intersection on Coburg Road near the Oakway and asked if that was a similar situation. He said the low amount of traffic on Wayside could be operated by a traffic activated switch. He said the neighbors may not have been in favor of the roundabout if this other option with a signaled intersection had been given. He referred to the diagram on page 35 of 42 in the agenda packet, which depicts the intersection without the roundabout. There are two left turn lanes coming from MLK, turning left on Hayden Bridge. He asked why two left turn lanes would be needed off of MLK, which would extend that portion of the road making it more difficult to have a traffic signal. He asked if it was anticipated that there would be that much increased traffic on MLK turning left on Hayden Bridge.

Mr. Arnis said staff and the county did extensive research of this intersection, and determined that, although it was not preferred, it would be necessary to provide two left turn lanes.

Councilor Woodrow asked where they got their statistical data regarding traffic because there is no road there at this time. He asked if the traffic coming from GameFarm was a factor.

Mr. Arnis said they started with a regional model which showed how many trips would be produced for certain land uses. They also relied on the traffic study from PeaceHealth which projected the traffic volumes for PeaceHealth and the entire area. Staff did a Gateway traffic study about five years ago and that was also used for reference. They also referred to the I-

5/Beltline interchange Environmental Assessment study. Using those references, they made estimates on the traffic for that intersection.

Councilor Woodrow doesn't feel that number of cars would turn left at that intersection. He referred to page 17 of 42 which refers to the agreement between the City of Springfield and Springfield Utility Board (SUB). This agreement states that SUB would pay for half of the cost if the lines were required to be relocated. He asked if that included the cost of putting the power lines under ground.

Mr. Arnis said SUB would only pay for half of the cost of moving the transmission lines within the median. It does not include going under ground. They would pay up to \$120,000 for moving the lines underground.

Councilor Woodrow asked if there would be room for a bike lane or sidewalk with the 82.5 foot proposal

Mr. Arnis said there would be room for a bike lane with the additional 6 feet. That would only allow two feet for landscaping and shoulder. Staff is still balancing out those design details. A bike lane could be provided.

Councilor Fitch referred to the roundabout in the Thurston area and the support staff has gained from surrounding neighbors in that area. She heard, however, from citizens who discussed trucks getting stuck in roundabouts in the Thurston area and near Symantec. She suggested having LTD, OTA and the trucking companies look at the proposed roundabout to insure these vehicles could pass through.

Mr. Arnis agreed with Councilor Fitch. He said Brian Ray from Kittleson Associates, who was in the audience, assisted staff with the early phases of the roundabout. Cary Standley, a soundwall consultant, was also present in the audience.

Councilor Fitch discussed the exclusive lane that LTD is hoping to have for its BRT from Glenwood to the MLK Parkway. She discussed the future possibility of undergrounding the power lines. Once the soundwalls are in place, it is unlikely they would be moved to accommodate an additional lane.

Councilor Ralston said there are two 82.5 foot options included in the agenda packet. He asked why the landscaping would be necessary on both sides if there is no BRT lane. He asked if a bike lane could be put in instead.

Mr. Arnis said six feet is about the minimal for a shoulder to allow room for a car to pull over for safety reasons or for maintenance vehicles. Staff could try to get bike lanes on both sides. He discussed the permanence of the soundwalls and the power lines.

Councilor Ballew discussed landscaping.

Councilor Woodrow said he understands there could be training for citizens on the use of the roundabout, but this will be a route to a regional medical center and training could not be given for the number of people who come from outside the area.

Councilor Ballew discussed the service levels for the signaled intersection and the roundabout. She said a good service level would be especially important when trying to get to a hospital.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:58 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

Amy Sowa  
City Recorder